United Nations S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Fifty-sixth year

Provisional

4272nd meeting

Monday, 5 February 2001, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Ben Mustapha	(Tunisia)
Members:	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	China	Mr. Shen Guofang
	Colombia	Mr. Valdivieso
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Mali	Mr. Kassé
	Mauritius	Mr. Neewoor
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Gatilov
	Singapore	Mr. Mahbubani
	Ukraine	Mr. Kuchynski
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach

Letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/82)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

01-23861 (E)

The meeting was resumed at 3.20 p.m.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Sweden. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Norström (Sweden): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union - Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia - and the associated countries, Cyprus and Malta, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area, Iceland and Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

The absence of war is not the same as lasting peace. A ceasefire is seldom the end of a conflict but, at best, a first step towards the peaceful settlement of armed conflict. We know, from often painful experience, how difficult it is to sustain a peace that does not rest on a solid base. Therefore, a long-term and comprehensive approach is necessary to resolve discord, consolidate peace and prevent the resurgence of conflict.

We must all act to ensure that efforts to foster peace and stability before, during and after armed conflict are well coordinated and part of a coherent strategy. This means linking together long-term efforts of conflict prevention and peace-building with more short-term efforts, such as peacekeeping and other forms of crisis management.

The European Union welcomes today's debate as a sign of an increasing awareness of the importance of linking together the range of measures to build peace. For example, the maintenance of peace requires that the root causes of conflict be addressed. The European Union welcomes the emphasis in the Brahimi report on this aspect and appreciates in particular that the report presents conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peace-building as a continuum of measures aimed at building a solid foundation for peace.

While acknowledging that there may be differences in emphasis between preventive and post-conflict peace-building, the European Union believes that any sharp distinction overlooks the fact that the tools deployed in both situations are broadly similar. In fact, there is a circular effect, since measures that effectively build peace also serve the purpose of preventing conflict from recurring.

The European Union believes that the concept of peace-building must encompass concrete measures targeted at preventing disputes from turning into violence. For example, combating illicit trade in small arms or conflict diamonds can contribute to preventing conflicts and building sustainable peace. Furthermore, peace-building efforts should include confidence-building measures and the promotion of national reconciliation, as well as programmes for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants. Such a comprehensive approach is also needed to ensure an effective response to suffering and insecurity caused by, for example, small arms and light weapons and the use of child soldiers.

The European Union attaches particular importance to integrated and effective measures to achieve sustainable post-conflict repatriation and reintegration of refugees and other displaced persons. Attention must also be given to the effects on the stability of the host country or surrounding areas of refugees in temporary settlements.

The concept of peacekeeping entails long-term efforts aimed at preventing armed conflict from erupting in the first place by addressing its deep-rooted structural causes. This includes broader measures in the political, institutional, economic and developmental fields, ranging from trade and environment to good governance and human rights. Sustainable development is clearly an essential factor in peace-building. Combating poverty and promoting an equitable distribution of resources are vital elements in preventing conflict and consolidating peace.

The European Union is in the process of reforming its external aid in order to make it more coherent in its approach to third countries, more focused on clear policy objectives, more flexible in responding to a rapidly changing international environment and more consistent in its implementation. One of the features of the reform is closer coordination with other international donors, as highlighted by Commissioner Nielson's recent visit to New York. Furthermore, the European Union has made substantial progress in developing its capabilities for crisis management. These capacities will be of importance in the broader context of peace-building, through, for example, the provision by the European Union of

civilian police in international missions as a form of voluntary cooperation. Moreover, a programme aimed at strengthening the preventive capacities of the European Union will be considered by the European Council in June 2001.

The pursuit of justice and reconciliation is pivotal for effective peace-building. The rule of law, full respect for human rights, democratic foundations for political and judicial systems, and their democratic functioning must be ensured. Good governance, including the promotion of accountability and transparency in public decision-making and the effective participation of civil society and political pluralism and legitimacy, is also a fundamental component.

The European Union wishes to emphasize the important role of international law in building peace. For example, the International Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda and for the former Yugoslavia have served important accountability, reconciliation, deterrence and peace-building functions. The European Union has actively supported measures to ensure accountability for criminal acts under international law. We wish to underline in this regard the importance of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and renew our call upon all States to become parties to the Statute.

We would also like to highlight the role played by civil society, in particular at the local level, in fostering reconciliation. Avoiding marginalization and discrimination are cornerstones of effective peace-building. Measures to promote equality and ensure respect for human rights should therefore be included in any strategy aimed at building sustainable peace. In this context, the European Union wishes to underline the central role played by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the importance of adequate support for effective programmes undertaken by her Office.

The United Nations, with its Charter responsibilities, global presence and broad institutional framework, is uniquely placed both to tackle root causes of conflict and to take short-term preventive measures. But the challenges confronting the international community in the promotion and maintenance of peace are both numerous and diverse. They thus require joint efforts and complex, integrated policy responses that must be delivered by a broad range of actors, including those with specific mandates under international law.

It is well recognized that Security Council peacekeeping mandates should incorporate, as appropriate, peace-building elements, when called for, to support a peace process in order to establish at an early point the activities necessary for peace-building and to determine the means of coordination and cooperation, both between the various components of the peacekeeping operation and with other relevant actors. When a peacekeeping presence is reduced or withdrawn, it is also important to ensure that peace-building activities can be undertaken in an environment that does not threaten peace. Thus, the Security Council must not disengage too early. The smooth transition from peacekeeping to peace-building and a sound exit strategy are fundamental elements for preventing a conflict from recurring. This was amply emphasized in the Security Council debate in November 2000 on the item "No exit without strategy".

The European Union recognizes the need for close cooperation and dialogue, carried out in a mutually reinforcing manner, among United Nations bodies in support of effective peace-building, and it notes in that context the important functions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council in the areas of rehabilitation and reconstruction.

The role of the Secretary-General and of the Secretariat is crucial. We particularly recognize the importance of strengthening the information-gathering and analytical capacity of the Secretariat. Adequate resources and support must, furthermore, be ensured to enable the Department of Political Affairs to perform effectively its role as focal point in peace-building and conflict prevention. The European Union welcomes the establishment of the Post-conflict Peace-building Unit in support of that role.

With regard to United Nations peace-building offices, the European Union considers that, where appropriate, they have a role in providing a focal point and in enhancing partnership and coordination arrangements in countries emerging from conflict. The European Union furthermore recalls the paramount importance of mobilizing, in a coordinated manner, all actors responsible for peace-building, in particular United Nations funds and programmes, the international financial institutions and bilateral donors,

with the aim both of ensuring their full and early participation in formulating comprehensive peace-building strategies, and of avoiding financial gaps between peacekeeping and peace-building activities.

Closer cooperation between the United Nations and its regional partners in tackling the challenges of peace is a key element. Successful peace-building requires active support from and participation by regional actors. The European Union is committed to building more effective partnerships, notably with the United Nations but also with other regional organizations. We would like also to point to the valuable contribution often made by civil society, including non-governmental organizations and the private sector, in the field of peace-building.

The United Nations and the regional actors possess different strengths and capabilities in the area of conflict prevention and peace-building. Their focus should be on achieving greater complementarity as mutually reinforcing institutions making use of comparative advantages. The fourth high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations, due to begin tomorrow here in New York, will provide an excellent opportunity to promote both complementarity and coordination.

Development activities and peace-building measures are two sides of the same coin. There can be no development without peace. The European Union fully recognizes the importance of development aid as a part of long-term efforts aimed at building prosperity and durable peace.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Baali (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation is delighted and proud to see this most important of organs meeting under the presidency of the representative of a country with so many strong links to our own, links forged over the centuries both in the struggle against adversity and in generous and fruitful exchanges that today move us towards a shared destiny. My pleasure is all the greater because for many years I have had the privilege of knowing you, Mr. President, as a talented diplomat who has placed his intelligence and his heart at the service of the cause of justice and progress and who will wisely guide the work of the Council towards the success we anticipate.

I wish also to express my appreciation and admiration to Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani of Singapore for his enormously successful presidency of the Security Council at a time when he was taking his first steps as a freshly elected newcomer to the Council.

The item, Mr. President, on which you have called for a transparent and democratic debate is a timely one, because it comes before the Council in the wake of the rich discussions held at the Millennium Summit and of those prompted by the report (S/2000/809) of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations chaired by Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi; it also lies at the heart of the whole question of peacekeeping. We must think together about the methodology to be followed and about the means to be put in place so that, once peace is restored after a given conflict, a process of peace-building can immediately be set in motion with a view to attaining lasting peace and stability. In other words, we must formulate and set up a comprehensive, integrated long-term strategy; this requires methodical organization, effective coordination, strict follow-up and, obviously, adequate financing.

To that end, it is useful if not imperative that certain conditions be met both in the preparation and in the implementation of such a strategy.

First of all, all those whose contribution is needed should be involved and should be able effectively to make that contribution. That applies, of course, to the Security Council, which under the Charter bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. But it applies also to the General Assembly and to the Economic and Social Council, which have a major role to play, as well as to the funds and agencies of the United Nations and to the Bretton Woods institutions, without whose involvement any effort in this sphere will be doomed to failure.

In addition to those key players, it is appropriate also to involve the States of the region concerned and regional and subregional political and economic groupings, which possess a keener knowledge of the situation on the ground and whose influence on the course of events can be decisive.

Also, the causes of conflict should be carefully analysed and properly addressed in order to avoid the same causes giving rise to the same effects. These causes are numerous, and often relate to poverty, a

source of frustration, despair and bitterness, as well as to a lack of democracy and to poor administration of public affairs. Particularly in the case of Africa, they can also relate to the injustice established by brutal colonization that did not respect human beings or the subtle balances established over centuries. They can relate too to the consequences of poor choices that may have been made, when emerging from the darkness of colonialism, by public authorities facing immense challenges and expectations that were as complex as they were urgent.

Finally, such a strategy must be able to offer the country or region concerned a real chance of resuming a normal life in peace and order, and above all of embarking on the path of progress, justice and freedom.

In that connection, let me share with the Council a number of thoughts and considerations. First, it is generally agreed today that disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programmes are a fundamental element in the process of peace-building. Indeed, last year the Security Council devoted a meeting to that subject, at which important thoughts and recommendations were set out. The proliferation of internal conflicts, in which Governments often face armed rebellion, involves the often difficult and complex task of demobilizing yesterday's rebels, who are today's partners for peace. That is why we suggest that, in cooperation with the Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, DDR programmes be included as one of the elements of operations. Such programmes should thus be a part of the activities of United Nations missions, in close cooperation with the parties; they should be financed from an operation's overall budget, as indeed was proposed by the General Assembly working group on the causes of conflict in Africa.

This is a complex and highly risky operation, undertaken to ensure the orderly and effective reintegration of former combatants into society in such a way that they are not tempted, for one reason or another, to take up their weapons again.

Special attention also needs to be given to the untenable tragedy of child soldiers. While calling for respect by the warring parties for civilians, especially women and children, and for the non-recruitment of soldiers under the age of 18, the international community must, through the United Nations and its funds and agencies, make a special effort genuinely to address the issue of child victims of war, be they direct or indirect participants, so as to give them the care they need and allow them to be gradually reintegrated into society.

Secondly, among the most tragic consequences of conflicts are the hordes of refugees cast onto the road of exile, of whom the media occasionally give us a glimpse in their untold suffering. This tragedy requires us to address a number of concerns, such as how to meet the needs of these refugees, ensure their protection and interact with the countries of asylum. While the return of refugees to their countries of origin must be a post-conflict priority, that return must nonetheless be correctly prepared for and implemented. The reintegration of refugees must, in fact, allow them gradually to resume a normal life thanks not only to the return of peace, but also to a process of reconstruction and economic recovery.

The special attention that refugees should enjoy is called for, inter alia, by the fact that they are in the category that has experienced the worst of war. It is therefore normal that they be able to see their situation improve with the return of peace. In this respect, the fundamental contribution must be made by national authorities, while international organizations — the United Nations in particular — must give the country concerned significant assistance, especially since the reintegration of refugees generally leads to a reduction in the number of those who benefit from humanitarian assistance.

Thirdly, when war crimes or genocide have been perpetrated, as was the case in the former Yugoslavia and in Rwanda, justice must be implacable, because nothing is more pernicious or more fearsome than the culture of impunity. This iron fist must nonetheless be accompanied by a bold and determined effort to mend the broken fabric of the nation, rebuild the channels of expression and communication, gain strength, mobilize energies and establish the conditions for resumed social interaction. The international community should strive to encourage, facilitate and support this effort by giving it political, logistical and financial backing.

From this perspective, we can only welcome the establishment of the United Nations offices in Guinea-Bissau, the Central African Republic and Angola, as well as the activities of the United Nations Transitional

Administration in East Timor, for their invaluable contribution to those countries through their support for the promotion of human rights, the establishment and development of democratic institutions and the strengthening of their public administration capacities. Nevertheless, an additional effort must be made in the financial area, particularly in Africa, in order to ensure that this work continues and bears fruit.

Fourthly and finally, since development is another name for peace, it will always be necessary to establish a programme specially adapted to the needs of the country or region concerned and aimed at the rehabilitation of basic infrastructure, the construction of education and health centres, job creation and the relaunching of economic activity on a more sound and equitable basis. To that end, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Bretton Woods institutions have an important role to play in establishing the necessary strategies and in ensuring financing, without which no action worthy of that name can be undertaken.

Indeed, it is neither by draining the meagre and steadily declining resources of UNDP, nor by turning to conventional tools and methods of intervention — much less by piecemeal efforts, improvisation and posturing — that we will provide the necessary remedies for the economic and social problems that are often at the root of conflict or that we will eliminate their causes.

In this respect, we cannot consider the formula of pledging conferences always to be the appropriate one or even ever to have registered a real success. After a war, many countries and financial institutions rush to hastily organized conferences to promise their financial support, but those commitments, unfortunately, are not always followed up by action. The case of the most recent donor conference for the Central African Republic is significant in that respect.

Special treatment for the debt of countries affected by conflict and more advantageous loan conditions might perhaps be considered by the World Bank and by the donor countries. In general terms, more generous and effective development cooperation would contribute significantly to the reduction of sources of tension and conflict. The link between peace and development, which everyone now recognizes, should encourage us to step up our efforts to give concrete form to the various commitments undertaken here at the United Nations and at other forums to help the developing countries, especially the least developed among them, to prevent the outbreak or resurgence of conflict.

In implementing its policies on the ground, the Security Council has an extremely important tool in its peacekeeping missions. The United Nations offices are another tool available to the Organization as a whole, but their mandates and means would clearly benefit from being clarified, made more specific and, we would hope, strengthened, while their resources should be enhanced. Close and effective coordination should be established between the missions and the offices in order to avoid potential overlapping and to ensure coordinated and harmonious implementation of a peace-building strategy that involves actors other than the Security Council.

Indeed, it is useful to recall that the comprehensive, complex and demanding nature of post-conflict peace-building requires an effective contribution from other bodies, such as the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the United Nations Secretariat and its agencies and programmes, the Bretton Woods institutions and the regional organizations concerned. In other words, a partnership for peace must be established in clarity, transparency and respect for the mandates and powers of each.

These are the thoughts that I wished to share during this consideration of peace-building, which the Council has opened to discussion at just the right moment. I hope that this exercise at collective reflection will contribute to better organized peace-building operations in the future. They are a means of preventing conflicts that is ultimately less costly than the exercise of conflict resolution and certainly more orderly and calm, given that they are neither conceived nor implemented under the threat or pressure of events.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: I thank the representative of Algeria for his kind words addressed to me, as well as for his most instructive statement.

The next speaker on my list is the representative of Nigeria, whom I invite to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mbanefo (Nigeria): Let me first of all congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of

February. You can count on the support of the Nigerian delegation in the discharge of the onerous tasks ahead of you. Let me also congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani of Singapore, for the effective manner in which he guided the affairs of the Council last month. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his very important statement to the Council this morning. It was very instructive.

The whole question of peacekeeping operations in with all its ramifications is an issue that is very dear to my delegation, first because of Nigeria's involvement in United Nations peacekeeping operations and secondly because of our membership in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, of which I am honoured to be the Chairman.

Last year, a lot of energy was devoted during the Millennium Summit and the Millennium Assembly to the issue of peacekeeping operations. The report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, otherwise known as the Brahimi report, generated a lot of interest among Member States and renewed the momentum towards strengthening the capacity of United Nations peacekeeping operations. Both the Security Council and the General Assembly have respectively endorsed various recommendations of the Security Council Working Group and the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations in the Panel's report. The importance of the recommendations contained in the Brahimi report and the report of the Special Committee cannot be over-emphasized, particularly now that, in spite of the best efforts of the United Nations and other regional organizations, the theatre of conflict appears to be growing rather than diminishing.

Although sustaining peace and security for all countries and peoples has remained the central objective of the United Nations in the new millennium, as it was when the Organization was founded over half a century ago, we must recognize that there has been a shift in the nature of the threats to peace and security since the end of the cold war. Conflicts have moved from inter-State wars to intra-State wars. Where conflicts were once a result of ideological divisions of a bipolar world, they are now fuelled by ethnic and religious intolerance, political ambition and greed, which are often exacerbated by illegal trafficking in arms, gems and drugs.

In view of the complexities of the new challenges now facing our Organization, there is a need to adopt a holistic and multidisciplinary framework to tackle these challenges. Our conflict-management strategy must include a pre-conflict, intra-conflict and post-conflict framework. Our tendency to act before comprehending the dynamics of a conflict often exacerbates it. Our intervention strategy must be multilevel and multidimensional and must include proactive measures such as the establishment of early warning systems at the community, national and international levels. Also, it must include peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building strategies such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR).

While a universal or a global system of early warning is unlikely to emerge — as we have seen by the controversy that followed the Brahimi recommendation on the matter — there is nevertheless a need to cast our nets as wide as possible to attract all levels of input into the early warning system.

The multidimensional and multilateral character of conflicts requires the involvement of the various sectors of society, such as international organizations, State actors and non-governmental organizations. This is because there is no hegemonic power or universal institution with the autonomy, resources and motivation adequate to meet all the demands that are often faced by the managers of international peace and security.

In order for peacekeeping and peace-building to achieve their main objectives, negotiations must include a comprehensive effort to support structures that will sustain peace and create a sense of confidence in post-conflict situations. Our focus should be on addressing the socio-economic and political roots of a conflict to achieve a practical reconstruction of the State and the revitalization of the institutions of government. We should integrate economic, social and development tools into a coherent political agenda. This strategy is particularly important in countries with problems of ethnic marginalization, such as Liberia — where the United Nations opened its first post-conflict peace-building office in 1997 — Guinea-Bissau and Central Africa.

We are all aware of the vital role effective disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of combatants could play in the promotion of peace-building efforts. Consequently, to achieve this objective, sufficient resources must be made available to ensure the implementation of the DDR programmes. In addition, the former combatants must be given

occupational training and engage in income- and employment-generating projects, which would facilitate their smooth integration into civilian life. These projects could be financed through the efforts of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, international financial institutions, multilateral agencies and other partners.

Closely related to this subject is the need to ensure efficient disarmament and to combat the issue of illicit traffic in arms because of the risk this poses to any peace-building effort. We would recall that the Bamako Declaration of 30 November 2000 on trafficking in small arms and light weapons specifically recommended that Member States should put in place national coordination agencies and appropriate institutional infrastructure to help in the monitoring of the proliferation, control, circulation and trafficking in small arms and light weapons. This initiative should be supported and sustained.

Another important area requiring our attention is the need to assist countries emerging from conflict to embark on projects with a special focus on poverty eradication, rebuilding infrastructure and sustainable development. This strategy is consistent with Security Council resolution 1318 (2000), which strongly encourages the development within the United Nations system of a comprehensive and integrated strategy to address the root causes of conflict, including their economic and social dimensions.

The main consequence of any conflict situation is the generation of refugees and internally displaced persons, the majority of whom are often women and children. Given such gloomy and agonizing circumstances, our delegation believes that the resettlement of refugees will be more meaningful if it is carried out within the context of efforts to revive economic activity and repair the social fabric. This is likely to permanently resolve the problems of insecurity and social tension that are often associated with post-conflict situations.

Furthermore, States must ensure good governance and respect for human rights and the rule of law. The Nigerian delegation believes that the international community should assist countries emerging from conflict in the establishment of democratic institutions and the rule of law. Assistance should be provided to rebuild such institutions as the judiciary, police and the civil service.

We are happy to note that recently the Security Council has included peace-building components in its mandates for peacekeeping operations such as the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA), the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), just to mention a few. We are also delighted to note that peace-building programmes are being implemented in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea-Bissau, among others.

As mentioned earlier, the Nigerian delegation is of the view that a peace-building strategy requires a comprehensive and integrated approach involving all international partners and local and regional actors. We are of the opinion that as soon as preparations for peacekeeping operations are undertaken, consultations should be held by the Secretariat and the Security Council with all partners with a view to devising appropriate peace-building strategies and mobilizing of necessary resources. The Security Council should hold consultations with such partners as international financial institutions and regional and subregional organizations, so as to enable it to identify the role of each participant. This will facilitate close coordination among all actors.

Finally, let me conclude by saying that even though the Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, present day reality makes other State and non-State actors essential to the effective achievement of international peace and security. We therefore hope that the present level of cooperation among stakeholders will be sustained.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to thank the representative of Nigeria for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the Republic of Korea. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sun Joun-yung (Republic of Korea): I would like to begin by congratulating you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the Council presidency for the month of February. The subject of today's debate is both relevant and timely, especially considering the convening of the fourth United Nations regional organizations high-level meeting tomorrow to

once again take up this important issue as a part of its own agenda. In this regard, we appreciate Tunisia's initiative in requesting the Council to revisit the issue of peace-building in a comprehensive manner.

Since the complexity of new security challenges was properly pointed out by the Secretary-General in his publication "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111) in 1992 and its Supplement (S/1995/1) in 1995, much has been discussed and many new strategies have been conceived. Peacekeeping operations are adapting to the complex and multidimensional aspects of the new reality. We therefore welcome the recent tendency whereby the mandates of peacekeeping operations include post-conflict peace-building components.

During last month's open debate on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries, many Member States pointed out that consultations among the main parties concerned should start at the earliest possible stage of decision-making of a peacekeeping operation. We would like to reiterate that such early arrangements would be crucial in establishing a well-planned peace-building strategy in the peacekeeping operation's mandate.

Taking this opportunity, we would like to welcome the establishment of the working group of the whole on United Nations peacekeeping operations. We expect its work to lead to systematically enhanced cooperation with the troop contributors and their participation in the decision-making process.

It is now commonly acknowledged that conflict prevention, peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building are interlinked and are more effective if pursued simultaneously, rather than sequentially. Accordingly, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants are prerequisites for immediate post-conflict stability and prevention of a conflict's recurrence. Peace, security and economic and social development are also closely interlinked. The protection of refugees and internally displaced persons is also an essential part of today's peace-building measures. Their safe return and rehabilitation are among the most basic conditions for reintegration and stability in the affected region.

Against this backdrop, I would like to make a few comments on issues to which we attach particular significance.

Above all, peacekeeping operation mandates should always be realistic and cost-effective for the success of the missions. A key factor to be taken into consideration in order to make a peace-building strategy successful is the availability of financial and other resources for a long-term strategy. When discussing the strategy for United Nations engagement in post-conflict situations, a feasible scenario must be drawn out at a very early stage to clarify the United Nations role and function.

The most cost-effective strategy would be to enhance the preventive capacity of the United Nations. In our view, the direct involvement of this Council and an enhanced role for the Secretary-General should be further encouraged for the effective management of conflicts at all levels. We believe that the Secretary-General plays an instrumental role by continuously monitoring the situation of regions with current, past and potential conflicts and by updating the Council on his findings and views. Since timeliness is a critical element in intervention, the reports of the Secretary-General must be prepared at a most pertinent juncture and be given due consideration by the Council.

We expect that the various actors, such as the United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies, international financial institutions, particularly the Bretton Woods institutions, and regional organizations will further enhance their efforts to systematically coordinate an integrated response. Moreover, a strengthened partnership with non-governmental organizations will contribute positively to aggregating necessary support by widening the pool of volunteer workers. However, in a situation where a variety of players from different entities get involved, due caution is necessary to avoid the duplication of work and competition for limited resources.

In this regard, we take note that the Security Council has underlined in past reports the need to clearly define tasks and divide responsibilities among all actors involved. My delegation concurs with the observation in the Brahimi report that it is necessary to establish a focal point for peace-building. In this regard, the suggestion in the report that the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, as the Convener of the Executive Committee on Peace and Security (ECPS) be the focal point, merits further consideration. The strengthening of the function of ECPS will contribute to upgrading the capacity of the United Nations to forge a comprehensive strategy and to better

coordinate with other actors. My delegation also supports the ongoing efforts of the Department of Political Affairs and the United Nations Development Programme to jointly strengthen United Nations capacity in the area of peace-building.

In closing, let me underscore the role of regional organizations and the countries of the region concerned. The success of any peace-building operation may become elusive without strong political will and the support of the Member States. In particular, we believe that a more proactive engagement on the part of the countries and organizations of the affected region is crucial. Given the complexity of coordination among different players and the difficulty of mobilizing a full-scale intervention by the international community, the regional entities and countries should be encouraged to take the initiative.

We have already witnessed some cases where the courageous involvement of regional organizations and countries in peacekeeping operations facilitated the peace-building process in the affected region. These examples demonstrate the need for countries to share an enhanced sense of responsibility and cooperation in preventing conflicts and in keeping and building peace in their own regions. We hope that the upcoming high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations will yield a productive discourse on this important subject.

It is our firm belief that the assistance of the international community will be genuinely meaningful when the parties directly concerned demonstrate their commitments at a matching level.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: I thank the representative of the Republic of Korea for his kind words addressed to me.

I should like to take this opportunity to welcome, on behalf of the Council, Mr. Esmat Abdul-Maguid, the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, who has joined us this afternoon.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Aboulgheit (Egypt) *(spoke in Arabic)*: First of all, I should like to say, Mr. President, that my country holds your sisterly country and people in high regard. Today, by happy coincidence, the President of Egypt, Mr. Hosni Mubarak, is visiting Tunisia — that green and beautiful country — within the framework of the constructive communication between our two peoples and our two Governments. I should like to extend to you, Sir, my thanks for organizing this important discussion, which we hope will make a further contribution to the efforts and endeavours of the United Nations on the issue under consideration.

The issue that we are discussing today is very important — indeed, it is vital. Egypt believes that the importance of the issue, with its complex elements and its multifaceted character, is such that a single United Nations body — even the Security Council — cannot deal with it in its entirety. In fact, as the Tunisian working paper that you, Mr. President, have distributed in preparation for this meeting, makes clear, the matter requires cooperation between all the main bodies of the Organization, including the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, in addition to the Secretariat, presided over by the Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, in whose leadership, wisdom and continuous efforts in the service of the Organization and its noble goals we have every confidence.

We believe that all these bodies should carry out their work, each within its own competence and in accordance with its mandate, in conformity with the Charter. In addition, the United Nations specialized agencies and their executive boards should work to fulfil these objectives.

From that perspective, I should like to deal with a number of points to which my delegation attaches great importance when discussing the issue of peace-building. First, from a theoretical point of view, it might seem that the establishment of an agreed strategy or comprehensive, joint approach to peace-building is not difficult to achieve. However, the fact is that the specifics of any individual case prevent us from committing ourselves to the idea of a joint approach that can be implemented across the board. Each case has its own specific characteristics. We believe, therefore, that during the post-conflict phases in countries and communities that have been destroyed or severely affected by conflict, the United Nations must have a large degree of flexibility so as to ensure that stereotyping does not lead to disregarding or misrepresenting some of the important elements in any particular case.

Secondly, the importance that the Security Council attaches to the issue of peace-building — an issue that, as I pointed out earlier, falls within the competence of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council — is something for which we should be grateful to the Council. We would prefer the Security Council to give more attention to emerging or ongoing conflicts, or to situations that seem likely to erupt into full-blown conflict. We would like to see the Security Council focus on peace-building in a controlled manner as it relates to post-conflict situations so that it is not diverted from its main function of maintaining international peace and security. We should also like to emphasize how important it is for the Security Council to deal with issues without applying double standards, which often happens in the implementation of its resolutions, and to show more enthusiasm with regard to the situation in countries such as Somalia and Angola and in the Middle East. In our view, regrettably, the Security Council does not fully assume its responsibilities when it comes to the Middle East.

We believe that this is an important point, since this Council is authorized by the Member States to maintain international peace and security. It is unacceptable to allow the Security Council to fail in performing such functions, or for it to consider issues that, though recognized as being important, the Council does not have a recognized mandate to deal with or to control.

Thirdly, we noted in many cases that the failure of efforts to build peace in post-conflict situations can be attributed to the incorrect handling of a number of elements during the period in which the Council intervenes on behalf of the international community to settle the dispute and to maintain peace and security after bringing the conflict under control. A case in point is the failure in helping Angola to return to a state of peace and stability after the difficulties that the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme faced there. The fact that this programme has failed to gain the support of the opposition movement there is one of the reasons that led to the failure of the endeavours of the United Nations and to its almost total withdrawal from the Angolan scene.

Fourthly, we believe that the Council could attach the necessary importance and give the necessary follow-up to the issue of disarming combatants and reintegrating them into post-conflict societies. This is a very important element that allows — if implemented properly, as the case of Mozambique clearly shows — a whole society to reach a safe haven. The Security Council could take up a coordinating role, along with the Secretariat, the relevant agencies and bodies and the neighbouring countries, in dealing with the issue of refugees and displaced persons from the point of view of its possible impact on the continuation of a conflict or its rekindling after a period of calm. I must refer here to the oldest existing refugee issue in the world: the question of the Palestinian refugees and the imperative of settling this question with methods that are in line with international legitimacy so that it becomes a complementary element to a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East instead of being an element that prevents the reaching of any such settlement.

As for the other proposed points, such as sustainable development, the eradication of poverty, supporting the rule of law and democratic institutions, they are all matters that have a prominent position in any strategy for building peace. We could not even conceive of building a truly permanent peace in any country emerging from conflict without seriously dealing with these elements. Egypt believes that these basic matters should be dealt with through the other main bodies of the United Nations. However, the Security Council could take these very important dimensions into consideration when intervening in any conflict. Then it should work to provide the appropriate climate for restoring peace as soon as possible so that the main bodies and the specialized agencies of the Organization, regional organizations and neighbouring countries could take up their responsibility.

We do not want our Security Council to be transformed into an Economic and Social Council or into a private, miniature General Assembly, particularly since there is a high degree of politicization in its work that contradicts the nature and the working methods of the two other bodies mentioned. The mandate and competence of the Council, in accordance with the Charter, are not comprehensive; they are in fact limited. There is no doubt that this limitation of its mandate by the founding fathers of the United Nations was intentional. This intention should be upheld and respected by the Member States.

This does not mean that we are not satisfied to see the Security Council show interest in post-conflict

phases and situations and strategies for building peace. Concerning the way the Council could contribute in this domain, we believe that there is an attempt by the Council, within the framework of interpreting the text of the Charter and of dealing with the text with a large degree of flexibility, to contribute in some form towards encouraging and assisting the international community to focus on how to ensure that societies do not return once again to conflict after conflicts have been brought under control through serious effort for the maintenance of peace and security. Therefore, the Council should recommend a loose framework for how to determine the general priorities of what the other principal bodies should focus on — within the framework of their mandate and their competence, in a way that brings about some balance between these different bodies so that there is no overlapping in their functions and so that they will work towards one clear and agreed upon strategy to rebuild failed or destroyed communities after conflict or communities that have been exposed to special circumstances, such as in Kosovo and East Timor.

We believe that it is important not to forget that peace in itself is a difficult goal to attain. There are many communities and societies around the world that look to the Security Council to bring about the attainment of that objective. Somalia does not enjoy the necessary degree of attention yet. Angola, as we stated earlier, has returned to the vicious spiral of violence after 4 years of calm. And the United Nations stands before the problems in the Congo in astonishment and surprise, as if it does not have the necessary mechanisms and tools to restore stability to that vast African State.

Here I do not wish to deal with the Middle East, considering that the issue will force some members of the Council not to undertake their responsibilities, as we have seen recently.

Finally, there are many conflicts and struggles that fall within the mandate and the competence of the Council. The international community looks forward to the Council's dealing with these issues seriously and decisively so as to restore peace and stability to the world.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Egypt for the kind words he addressed to me and to my country.

The next speaker is the representative of Senegal. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Ka (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): I wish at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on the assumption by your country, Tunisia, of the presidency of the Security Council for February. At the same time, we thank you for the timely convening of today's debate, which is explicitly setting out the challenges of peace-building and of the management of post-conflict situations.

The question of peace-building is both sensitive and complex in all its aspects, because it has two bases and, more specifically, because it rests on two pillars whose characteristics are often difficult to reconcile. They are the need, first, to safeguard the gains of a peace agreement that is supposed to put an end to a conflict and, secondly, to bring about the adoption of measures that will promote the linkages among peace, security, stability and economic and social development so as to enable communities rent asunder by conflict to regain peace, rebuild their country and restore a stable society whose members have attained reconciliation.

To be effective and credible, therefore, any approach to post-conflict peace-building should include the immediate implementation of a series of determined, consistent measures to prevent actions that could jeopardize a peace agreement and possibly lead to a resumption of hostilities. In the long term, integrated and sustainable action should follow, aimed first and foremost at the rebuilding of the conflict-ravaged country.

Finally, if it is to have any hope of success, any approach to peace-building should consider the underlying causes of the conflict, not merely its effects: in many countries at war, especially in Africa, those causes commonly include fragile political institutions, endemic poverty, colossal debt and a climate of insecurity at home and abroad.

To address all these elements, it is not only necessary to take difficult political decisions; also, Governments and the international community must manifest a strong and unequivocal commitment to become genuinely involved in long-term development activities supported by the adequate and timely provision of resources. But we are obliged to note with regret that in the majority of situations — for example in Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African

Republic — neither Governments nor the international community were able to respond promptly and effectively to the needs dictated by the situations for supporting the peace-building process that had been put in place.

Mr. President, in your note entitled "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach", you rightly stressed that

> "Peace-building calls for an integrated strategy comprising a series of actions on various fronts: political, military, diplomatic, economic, social and institutional ... which together form a coherent social context". (*S/2001/82, annex*)

Meeting such a great challenge requires clear and sustained political will and synergistic efforts that are well formulated and well organized.

To construct an integrated strategy for peace-building it is necessary, first, to avoid making — as the Minister for Development Cooperation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recently put it — an artificial division of conflicts into various stages: pre-conflict prevention; the conflict itself; and the post-conflict period. Such a division derives from a particular mind-set and bears no relation to the facts on the ground: most present-day conflicts, especially in Africa, result from institutional weakness, from power struggles and from societal fragility; these often undermine the legitimacy of Governments. These factors must be taken into account when the mandates of peacemaking and post-conflict peace-building missions are being defined.

Secondly, given its multidisciplinary nature, peace-building must be an essential element of an integrated, comprehensive approach which includes poverty reduction, promotes policies of good governance and the rule of law, and strengthens the elements of an active civil society that can provide support and advice during the peace-building phase.

Thirdly, the international financial institutions and the bilateral donor community must have a better defined involvement in peace-building, for we know that the structural adjustment programmes that accompany the economic reform process too often trigger vulnerability that can give rise to frustration and social tension which, if not carefully treated, can create a climate that can destroy peacemaking and post-conflict peace-building efforts. It is therefore important for international financial institutions and the donor community to take these dangers into account and to try as best they can to strike a just balance between the demands of macroeconomic stability and the priorities for the restoration of peace, which call for greater flexibility in allocating resources for the economic recovery of countries emerging from war.

Fourthly, a sine qua non for restoring stability to countries emerging from conflict is unquestionably the way in which former soldiers, refugees and displaced persons are treated. The highest priority should be attached to programmes of disarmament, demobilization, rehabilitation and reintegration, with a view to finding humane solutions that address the causes of conflict and that thus avoid weakening the legitimate expectations raised by the conclusion of a peace agreement. Unfortunately, the examples of Guinea-Bissau and of Sierra Leone remind us that adequate resources arrive too late.

Fifthly, if we wish to see peace built, we must also pay specific attention to the struggle against the distribution of light weapons, which often fall into the hands of outlaw groups, and we must address the issue of the orderly return of displaced persons and refugees to their country of origin. We must also tackle the living conditions of refugees in host countries, whose burden must be eased by substantial international support programmes.

Sixthly, in order to build sustainable peace, we must strive after every conflict to establish a culture of peace, tolerance, national rebirth and social equalization so as to rebuild society along more harmonious and egalitarian lines.

In making these recommendations, we cannot overemphasize the need to provide support missions for peace-building programmes with sufficient resources to allow them credibly to discharge their peacekeeping mandate.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that peace-building is a multidimensional process. Its commendable objectives are to break cycles of violence and, above all, to contribute to the establishment of a climate of peace and sustainable development through the use of consistent strategies in various fields. Such a process clearly calls for the United Nations, and above all the Security Council, to assume the primary responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security. This reflects the

great importance that my delegation attaches to today's debate and, in particular, to the results of the Council's deliberations.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Senegal for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Guatemala. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Rosenthal (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation has studied with the greatest interest your proposal, Sir, contained in document S/2001/82, that the Security Council address at an open meeting the item entitled "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach". We congratulate you for the initiative of convening this meeting, which we feel is very relevant to the work of the Council.

As the representative of Ireland reminded us this morning, Guatemala is one of the countries in which the United Nations has been involved in a lengthy negotiation process to resolve a domestic armed conflict, which subsequently gave rise to a peace-building and peace-consolidation effort. I would like to take this opportunity to share some of the lessons we have learned from this exercise. We do so in the full understanding that every process has distinct features that are not easily transferable to other situations. At the same time, however, each process has sufficient shared characteristics to contribute to the accumulated experience and knowledge of the United Nations in carrying out its various peace operations.

As members of this Council know, in December 1996, with the invaluable assistance of the United Nations, we brought to an end a domestic armed conflict that had raged in Guatemala for some 36 years. This confrontation took tens of thousands of human lives, gave rise to grave human rights violations and not only inflicted physical injury and other suffering on many of its victims, a large number of whom became refugees, but inevitably did serious damage to the country's economy.

The roots of the conflict are complex. They include age-old social demands on the part of some sectors of the nation that the many manifestations of social injustice be redressed. These include poverty, unequal distribution of income and property, the resultant inequality in access to services, the violation of human rights, exclusion and marginalization, and racial and gender discrimination. The conflict and the polarization that ensued over the way in which those demands were to be met were substantially intensified by the fact that the conflict in Guatemala was subjected to the tensions peculiar to the so-called cold war. Indeed, the fall of the Berlin Wall and its consequences restored a more manageable scope to the domestic conflict, which enabled the Guatemalans themselves to take the lead in the search for a way out.

Therein lies the first lesson of the Guatemalan peace process. It was not imposed from outside, but rather reflected the genuine will of the parties to the conflict and of the Guatemalan population in general to put an end to war. To use a colloquial term, it was the Guatemalans who were in the driver's seat and it was the Guatemalans who showed, and continue to show, a commitment to peace. This is undoubtedly a prerequisite to the success of any peace-building effort.

The second lesson that can be drawn from the Guatemalan peace process is in line with the comprehensive approach that your letter advocates, Mr. President. The series of agreements that were negotiated over six years address the principal sources of the dissatisfaction of many Guatemalans. The titles of some of those agreements suffice to outline the causes of this discontent. Those titles include the following: Comprehensive Agreement on Human Rights; Agreement on Resettlement of the Population Groups Uprooted by the Armed Conflict; Agreement on the Establishment of the Commission to Clarify Past Human Rights Violations and Acts of Violence; Agreement on the Identity and Rights of Indigenous Peoples; Agreement on Social and Economic Aspects and the Agrarian Situation; Agreement on the Strengthening of Civilian Power and on the Role of the Armed Forces in a Democratic Society; Agreement on Constitutional Reforms and the Electoral Regime. Likewise, matters relating to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) are reflected in the Agreement on the Implementation, Compliance and Verification Timetable for the Peace Agreements.

Members of the Council will readily note the close correlation that exists between these peace agreements and the enumeration of various aspects of peace-building listed in part III of document S/2001/82. Taken as a whole, the commitments laid down in the Guatemalan Peace Agreements constitute a road-map showing the direction of a global effort

aimed at building and consolidating peace and that sets out the various economic, social, political and cultural aspects of this process. Moreover, those commitments have already successfully undergone an important trial by fire in that they have been accepted by all the parties as a solemn undertaking of the State. It is significant that the Government elected in December 1999, made up of the party that opposed the previous Government, made public its commitment to the Agreements.

A third lesson to be drawn from the Guatemalan experience underscores the usefulness of international support, particularly that of the United Nations. Even though the Organization was backed by a group of countries that acted as friends, it was the United Nations, in the last analysis, that projected the image of credibility, neutrality and objectivity that enabled it to play such an important role in backing the effort made by the Guatemalan people themselves to, first, achieve peace and, secondly, to build peace.

This role, had it been entrusted to any other external body, would surely have been viewed as an intrusion; yet, when fulfilled by the United Nations, it constituted the performance of a function expressly assigned to it by the parties to the conflict. And it is a function that was, and continues to be, carried out in an exemplary manner. In the first place, since 1994, the United Nations was active as a body facilitating the negotiation and conclusion of the Peace Agreements, as well as one that verified compliance with the Comprehensive Agreement on Human Rights. Thereafter, as from the entry into force of the Peace Agreements, its role encompassed the fulfilment of the totality of the undertakings laid down in those Agreements. On 19 December last, the General Assembly approved the extension of the mandate of the Verification Mission for the first year of a new phase covering the period 2001-2003.

As the fourth lesson to be drawn, it should be noted that regional bodies — another topic referred to in the Council's note — also played an important role in the process, this being true not only of the regional body *par excellence*, namely the Organization of American States (OAS). It should be recalled that a group of Latin American countries — which made up the so-called Contadora Group, and subsequently the Rio Group — sought to further the peace process throughout Central America, including, of course, the one unfolding in my country. It should also be recalled that it was the Central American Presidents, acting in unison, who adopted in Esquipulas the Framework Agreement within which the peace processes in El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua were inscribed.

But, contrary to the practice that prior to 1994 had prevailed in the application of Chapter VIII of the Charter, it was the United Nations that took the lead among the multilateral bodies in dealing with the Guatemalan situation. Thus, an important new precedent was established in relations between the United Nations and the OAS.

In the fifth and final case, it is usually said that in the case of Guatemala, the application of the Peace Agreements is irreversible. But this is not necessarily so. If the people of Guatemala do not perceive that their level of material and spiritual well-being has improved as a result of those Agreements, it is still conceptually plausible that regression might occur. For that reason, the Government is bent on promoting the fulfilment of the provisions of the Agreement on Social and Economic Aspects and the Agrarian Situation. In other words, if we fail to consolidate peace, this will surely reflect the fact that the old economic and social inequities incubating throughout my country were not properly addressed, thus proving once more the inseparable interrelationship between peace and development.

These are, in a nutshell, the experiences we can bring before the Council. In closing, Mr. President, we wish once more to express our appreciation to you for having taken the initiative of organizing this meeting.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: I thank the representative of Guatemala for his kind words.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, whom I invite to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Nejad Hosseinian (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, I wish to extend my congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. We have full confidence that under your wise guidance, the Council will make progress in dealing with the issues on its agenda. Let me also extend felicitations to your predecessor, Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani of Singapore, for his skilful stewardship of the Council's activities last month.

I would also like to say how pleased my delegation is to participate under your presidency in a Security Council debate on this important subject. We believe that the complexities of post-conflict peace-building and the challenges posed to the United Nations and the international community in general deserve thorough consideration.

In the post-cold war period, the dimension of United Nations activities changed significantly. Most new conflicts which started in the 1990s or continued into that decade were considered to be complex emergencies in development terms. Of the 27 major conflicts recorded in 1999, 25 were civil wars, generating a wide variety of problems for civilians and puzzlement for peaceful activists. In this context, peacekeeping operations stopped providing a buffer between two countries in combat and merely reported ceasefire violations after the opponents had decided to make peace. In the new environment they had to embark on a wide variety of complex tasks within State boundaries. In the process of dealing with the new and extremely complex situations, concepts such as preventive diplomacy, post-conflict peace-building and peace enforcement have emerged.

Extensive United Nations experience in peacekeeping, especially during the past decade, teaches us, among other things, that a ceasefire is not sufficient to ensure peaceful development in a war-torn society, and that a peacekeeping operation, even though it may be quite successful, does not completely prepare the ground and satisfy the requirements for building peace once a conflict is over. Too often we have seen hopes for a better future shattered. Too often the vicious cycle of violence has proved stronger than aspirations for peace.

Experience has also taught us how vital it is to ensure that, after conflicts, all the following conditions are met so that peace can endure. Every measure should be taken to strengthen confidence among the former parties to a conflict through dialogue, create a new climate favourable to national reconciliation and encourage the resumption of economic and social activities that improve the daily lives of a population by addressing the underlying causes of conflict.

Although each situation requires its own unique solutions, my delegation believes that there are some key principles that have general application in post-conflict peace-building. We would place timeliness of response at the top of any list of key principles. Given the importance of eliminating any possibility of a return to fighting, the effective implementation of peace-building programmes should be treated as an urgent matter. Thus, it is important to plan for post-conflict peace-building from the outset. When armed conflict is still ongoing, even before the start of a ceasefire, the needs of the societies concerned should be identified and the means for meeting them should be explored.

Measures aimed at building peace should be designed and implemented in close cooperation and consultation with those directly concerned, taking into consideration the specific conditions and needs in each particular situation. Specific requirements of the societies in question, together with their cultural characteristics, as well as the right of every State to freely choose and develop its economic, political, cultural and social systems in full freedom and in concert with basic international standards, should be taken into account.

Post-conflict peace-building activities should be carried out in full respect for the purposes of the United Nations Charter, in particular the principles of sovereign equality, political independence and non-intervention in matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. As a rule, they should be undertaken only at the request of and with the full consent of the State concerned.

The international community should give particular attention to the financing of economic recovery as part of post-conflict peace-building. Assistance in rebuilding the economic and social infrastructure, assistance in reintegration into the world economy, direct economic and financial assistance and the provision of humanitarian relief assistance are necessary for the successful reconstruction of societies emerging from war.

The early involvement of the local population in the reconstruction process and building local capacity to sustain peace in the fragile conditions of the post-conflict period should be an important focus of the international effort.

Measures towards the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants and identifying appropriate post-conflict roles for them is inevitably one of the most challenging tasks in peace-building and one of the most important keys to

avoiding the recurrence of violence and to building peace in post conflict situations. In this connection, devising, funding and implementing quick-impact projects aimed at improving quality of life and providing former combatants with a legitimate livelihood can help attain the objectives. The rapid deployment of a sufficient number of civilian police could also contribute to the return of law and order and thus to the re-emergence of an appropriate climate.

Here I wish to stress the importance of demining as one of the essential components of post-conflict peace-building. It is self-evident that the impact of anti-personnel landmines extends beyond an immediate danger to life and property to a wide array of socio-economic and developmental aspects in mine-affected countries.

Together with the aforementioned measures, there is usually an urgent need to help local communities revive and/or strengthen related rule-of-law elements and institutions. The re-establishment of a basic civil administration and a functioning legal system in a post-conflict environment, wherever the situation warrants, is among the necessary steps towards shaping governance institutions, civil society-building and effective civilian governance.

The process of peace-building requires that the United Nations play an integrated, multifaceted and more action-oriented role in order to create a climate conducive to political and economic stability in the State concerned. To this end, it is important to maintain close coordination between the two major organs of the United Nations: the General Assembly and the Security Council.

We believe that, in general, the key to better management of peace and security lies in a shared responsibility between the General Assembly and the Security Council; but when it comes to peace-building, it is beneficial to ensure a smooth transition from peacekeeping operations, which are usually established by the Security Council, to post-conflict peace-building activities under the supervision of the General Assembly.

Decisions on such activities should be entrusted primarily to the General Assembly, which could receive support from other principal organs of the United Nations and from the specialized agencies. There is no need to emphasize that the Security Council and all other United Nations organs should play a supportive role.

We also believe that the United Nations should be considered the focal point for peace-building to coordinate the many different activities and actors, including financial institutions, regional organizations and donor countries, that building peace entails. To this end, we find merit in the recommendation contained in the Brahimi report on the need for creating a consolidated and permanent institutional capacity within the United Nations system. We also support efforts under way by the Department of Political Affairs and the United Nations Development Programme to jointly strengthen United Nations capacity in this area.

We welcome the ongoing efforts of the Council to enhance the effective implementation of the arms embargoes already imposed by the Council on a number of conflicting parties throughout the world. We also commend the efforts undertaken recently aimed at putting an end to the pillaging of the national resources of nations and the diversion of the relevant benefits to the acquisition of weapons and military equipment. We believe that such measures not only facilitate peacemaking and peacekeeping efforts, but also help contain human losses and material damage in areas of conflict, thus rendering subsequent peace-building efforts less difficult and lengthy.

The Islamic Republic of Iran is following with great interest the ongoing deliberations on peace operations in the United Nations and is determined to further develop its capacity to contribute to these operations.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Satoh (Japan): First, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on assuming the leadership of the Council for the month of February and to express my sincere appreciation to you for convening this open meeting. My delegation firmly believes that it is important for issues relating to conflict prevention and peace-building to be discussed regularly in the Council, particularly at open meetings.

It is through such discussions that we will best be able to develop our ideas on this complex agenda item. These discussions can also increase awareness and understanding among Governments and other actors, including development agencies and non-governmental organizations, which could contribute to conflict prevention and peace-building efforts on the ground.

I commend you, Mr. President, for producing a useful working paper, which incorporates the fruit of past discussions and provides a basis for further progress. We also look forward to the Secretary-General's report on the prevention of armed conflict, to be submitted by May 2001, which should further facilitate our discussion.

For its part, in January 1998 in Tokyo, the Japanese Government hosted the International Conference on Preventive Strategy and, more recently, in July 2000, it chaired the G-8 Foreign Ministers' Meeting, which adopted the Miyazaki Initiatives for Conflict Prevention. We believe that the results of these meetings, which we shared with all Member States of the United Nations, were a useful contribution to this Organization's discussions.

As described in the working paper, there is already broad agreement on the need to pursue peace-building through a comprehensive and integrated approach. This involves taking appropriate steps at all stages of conflict, from the pre-conflict to the post-conflict stage, as well as addressing the root causes of conflict, including economic and social factors. The importance of involving donors, various organs and agencies of the United Nations, regional organizations and international financial institutions in a well-coordinated manner is also widely recognized.

Today I would like to emphasize a few points. We must be fully aware of the linkage between conflict and development, as was stressed not only in the Millennium Summit Declaration but also in the G-8 Miyazaki Initiatives. Peace and stability are prerequisites for sustainable economic development, and sustainable economic development fosters peace and stability by eliminating the root causes of conflict. In other words, peace-building efforts and development assistance must be mutually supportive, and, as Japan's Prime Minister, Yoshiro Mori, pointed out during his recent visit to three sub-Saharan States, the two efforts should be organically linked like the wheels of a cart.

Africa is a case in point. As Prime Minister Mori stressed during his visit to the region, it is the African region that requires this approach. The proliferation of conflicts in the region underscores the urgent need for a coherent strategy for peace-building and development. We believe that the United Nations and the broader international community should make this a priority at the beginning of this century.

Having recently witnessed the achievements of United Nations peacekeeping missions in Kosovo and East Timor, which have been given broad mandates that encompass reconstruction and capacity-building functions, we are all the more convinced that comprehensive peace-building and development efforts must be pursued in all regions of the globe.

For its part, Japan will remain committed to assisting African countries in their efforts to overcome the difficulties they face. Japan's firm commitment to a comprehensive approach to peace-building and development in that continent is reflected not only in its bilateral and multilateral development assistance but also in its sponsorship of the First and Second Tokyo International Conferences on African Development (TICAD). In the same spirit, Japan has proposed to hold ministerial-level talks on African development in Tokyo next December in preparation for a future third TICAD meeting.

It is widely acknowledged that all the relevant players must fulfil their respective roles in peace-building and development efforts. That is why Prime Minister Mori stated, during his visit to the region, that priority would be given to positioning TICAD as a forum where African nations themselves can discuss development strategies.

Lastly, I would like to stress once again that the Security Council should continue to enhance its consultations with players outside the Council. Comprehensive peace-building and development efforts that encompass economic and social dimensions cannot be pursued without the cooperation of donor countries and various agencies and institutions. This point was underscored by the active participation in the recent open debate on East Timor of non-Council members which are substantially involved in the issue, as well as the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. We hope that the Council will continue this practice.

The President: I thank the representative of Japan for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Romania. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Ducaru (Romania): It is my great pleasure to congratulate you, Ambassador Saïd Ben Mustapha, on taking over the presidency of the Security Council, and to warmly welcome this initiative to continue the practice of broader debates open to States that are not members of the Council. In the same spirit, I would like to extend warm congratulations to Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani of Singapore on the dynamic and efficient manner in which he managed the work of the Security Council during the month of January.

I would also like to commend the wise choice of an issue which goes to the core of the United Nations, namely, that of peace-building, and to say that we appreciate the value of the policy papers with which we were provided by the presidency.

While we associated ourselves with the European Union statement on this matter, we would like to add some considerations inspired by our own experience.

We all have a common agenda: to make sure that the world is safer, that new conflicts are prevented and that existing conflicts are contained and brought to a negotiated settlement. Romania shares the vision, expressed in the United Nations documents before us and highlighted by Secretary-General Kofi Annan this morning, that the concept of peace-building does not apply only to post-conflict situations but covers a continuum which links conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and post-conflict rehabilitation. That is why an integrated approach is required in this respect — an approach that enables the international community to cope with the deepest causes of conflicts, which often lie in the deficit of democracy and in underdevelopment.

Romania started its current Chairmanship-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) from the following premise: the security relationship between the United Nations and Europe has become more knotted than ever before. What is new in Europe is the emergence of a variety of actual and potential conflict situations that require full cooperation and a shared sense of purpose and of direction among the main organizations and institutions actively playing a role in the European area. The involvement of the United Nations in a continent that boasts the most sophisticated security alliance in history might seem paradoxical. Yet this decade has taught us that security can be jeopardized in many ways short of military attack, and preserving it requires more than military capabilities. The United Nations offers tools and experience in conflict prevention and post-conflict peace-building that are of great relevance for European needs today. At the same time, many of Europe's security institutions, starting with the OSCE, may provide best practices for the United Nations itself and for other regions. The idea of a coordinating meeting bringing together the executives representing the United Nations, the OSCE, the European Union, the Council of Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for example, on the theme of lessons learned in Balkans could be instrumental in order to enhance complementarity and synergy for greater coherence in policies and to develop effective networking, communication and information flows among them.

What we need is a comprehensive approach that takes all policies into account. Allow me in this respect to mention some priorities that could, in our view, be seen in their entirety as important guidelines for concrete exercises on peace-building.

The first priority is to keep the human dimension ever on top, including the protection of national and other minorities, the elimination of any kind of discrimination, coping with new threats — such as organized crime, trafficking in human beings and children in armed conflict — and the integration of refugees and displaced persons. Consequently, respect for human rights must be seen as a permanent and crucial dimension of any peace-building effort.

The second priority is to properly address the economic and environmental issues which are often the underlying reason for political instability. Any peace-building endeavour should start by identifying potential economic or environmental trouble spots and, on this basis, should continue by mobilizing States and other national or transnational actors to take the appropriate steps. In this respect, proper data, expert advice and unbiased views coming from any organization with competence in this area are welcome and should complement each other.

The third priority is to increase cooperation with non-governmental organizations. Their capabilities, mostly in terms of human resources, and the dedication of their staff often fill the gap between abstract political tasks set by the political and economic international organizations and the needs of real people in the field, who are so often paying the largest share of the toll of conflicts triggered by their leaders' ambitions.

The fourth priority is to approach any local conflict from a broader regional and international perspective. Each conflict is unique and raises unique problems; there are, however, regional conditions that none can ignore. Only a regional perspective can ensure the much-needed integrated and consistent approach to peace-building activities.

The fifth priority is to promote proactive and preventive diplomacy. One cannot repeat enough that prevention is cheaper than cure. As seen in the Balkans, Caucasus or elsewhere, most current conflicts have long historical roots. While trying to build peace for today, we should avoid sowing the seeds of future conflicts or wars.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Romania for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Mongolia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Enkhsaikhan (Mongolia): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I wish to express my delegation's appreciation to the Council for organizing this open debate on this topic prior to the fourth high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations, which will also consider the issue of peace-building.

In more than half a century of United Nations existence, the world Organization has largely been successful in mediating or contributing to the cessation of wars and conflicts in various parts of the world. Yet with the change of the nature of conflicts today, it is facing immense difficulties in meeting the challenge of averting, ending and healing intra-State conflicts, the viciousness and brutality of which have shocked the world community time and again. Our commitment under the Charter "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" obliges us to enhance the Organization's capacity in this particular area, especially in view of the inseparable link between conflict prevention and peace-building.

The report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, chaired by Ambassador Brahimi, identified sound peace-building strategy as one of the key conditions for the success of complex peace operations and presented forthright recommendations for change. The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, on its part, emphasized the necessity of incorporating elements of peace-building into the mandates of complex operations.

Thus, there is an array of measures that need to be seriously considered to improve the United Nations capacity to build peace and make it sustainable. The working paper presented by you, Mr. President, entitled "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach" has reflected the major elements without which peace-building would not be feasible, or even possible. The Secretary-General, in his address this morning, also clearly underlined the major areas where attention should be focused. Thus, tackling the issues of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants is essential for post-conflict peace-building. In this respect, in our view, the positive outcome of the Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects is crucial. It is to be hoped that the final document of the Conference will reflect the concerns expressed by the international community and recommendations to be proposed by the high-level meeting.

We also underline the importance of the successful reintegration of rival factions in post-war society for peace to be durable. This requires concerted efforts to restore and reinvigorate economic and social institutions. The efforts to relieve the plight of refugees and displaced persons need to be undertaken in the context of the efforts to repair the social fabric and to bring justice, as well as to restore economic activity. My delegation agrees that broader efforts to strengthen governance institutions and the rule of law are also necessary for ensuring lasting peace in post-war societies.

Although post-war conflicts of the past half century are framed as conflicts of ideology, identity and religion, in many cases their root causes lie in unpalatable poverty, unjust economic and political

arrangements, massive arms trade, inequality, failed Governments and misuse of power, as well as disputes over natural resources that in many instances involve powerful interests of external stakeholders.

The Millennium Declaration underpinned the concerted will of the international community to address those issues, and this meeting provides us with an exceptional opportunity to complement that willingness with the search for effective tools to do the work.

Peace-building is not a traditional foreign-policy or military issue. However, it is obvious that lasting peace cannot be enjoyed even by the rich in a world full of discontented poor. Studies conducted by the World Bank back in 1996 highlighted the direct correlation between poverty and conflict. The Bank noted that 15 of the 20 least developed countries in the world have been involved in major violent conflicts, and that more than half of all low-income countries were involved in major civil conflicts between 1980 and 1995. Thus, pursuit of the goal of eradicating poverty by such organizations as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization can be an important element of, and a contribution to, lasting peace and stability.

These efforts, however, would be more tangible if they were supported by confidence-building within specific regions and subregions. Regional organizations are vested with powers to deal with matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. Thus, the efforts of those organizations should go beyond confidence-building. Their efforts should seek to enhance regional capacities for preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping and peace enforcement. My delegation would like to underline that, in its view, there is a need for a clearer vision and division of the roles of the United Nations and regional organizations in peacekeeping and peace-building. The regional organizations, in our view, should engage more broadly in consultations with the Security Council on matters pertaining to prevention and regional peace-building. That message should be underlined at the fourth high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations.

Besides the involvement of regional organizations, that of civil society, as the Secretary-General underlined earlier today, is important. As current conflicts involve a multiplicity of formal and informal actors, the potential contribution of such significant players as the media, non-governmental organizations and religious organizations need to be channeled into peace-building. Thus, in our view, an added emphasis by the United Nations and the international community on strengthening and promoting local capacities for resolving conflict would contribute to long-term peace-building. This might include ways to strengthen the positive role of local media organizations in conflict-prone societies and to enhance dialogue between various non-governmental organizations, religious organizations and business circles in the early stages of conflict prevention.

While other institutions have an important role to play in peace-building, the United Nations is clearly expected to play a critical role as the coordinator of action to prevent and pre-empt violent conflicts, as is clear from today's debate here in the Council. We therefore should ensure that the United Nations is equipped with sufficient resources to effectively plan and carry out preventive measures. That question has yet to be specifically addressed; political will be needed. The prevention of conflicts also depends directly on the ability to correctly analyse the dynamics of events in a society and the root causes of tension within it. Therefore, the United Nations should develop, together with the relevant regional organizations, an adequate capacity to analyse the causes of conflict and should propose early action to prevent tension from escalating into violence.

In conclusion, allow me to express my delegation's support for efforts aimed at further enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations and its bodies in the area of peace-building. The Security Council, which possesses primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, can and should act as a catalyst for international efforts in this area.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Mongolia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Pal (India): It is not only a pleasure, but also very reassuring, to see you, the representative of a leading member of the Non-Aligned Movement, presiding over the Security Council as it considers

what its role might be in an area of the work of the United Nations where the clear view of the non-aligned is that most of what post-conflict peace-building involves lies outside the mandate of the Council, and properly within the purview of the General Assembly. May I also take this opportunity to congratulate Singapore very warmly on the outstanding work it did during its presidency; the credit for this goes to Ambassador Mahbubani and his dedicated staff.

In a detailed statement when the Council discussed this matter in 1998, we set out the reasons why it would do more harm than good if the Security Council trespassed on the mandate of others. Those arguments remain valid, and I will not repeat them. We would be glad to send copies of our statement to Council members who want to refresh their memories.

As the cold war showed, conflicts might end and peace-building begin without the Council's being involved. The huge challenges that the countries in transition in Central and Eastern Europe now face have their roots in that conflict, and they are identical to the priorities the United Nations lists for post-conflict societies: putting in place representative systems of governance, building an inclusive society, setting up a liberal economy, and coping with the difficulties of demobilization. The countries in transition need, and have received, special attention from the entire United Nations system; the one body not engaged in post-conflict peace-building there is the Security Council, which has, prudently and correctly, kept its distance.

Where the Council has helped settle conflicts, or where the United Nations is asked to monitor peace agreements negotiated by others, it has a role to play in setting up the peacekeeping operations which are part of the process of building peace. But it does not follow that these must take on the work of economic and social reconstruction, or that the Security Council should ask them to do so. Much has been said of the new peacekeeping and of how it is completely different from the old, but this ignores facts. Consider the operations now in place. Some points become clear: the majority are still groups of observers or formed contingents observing a truce, even if they are deployed within a single country; the operations in Georgia and Tajikistan are cases in point.

Major operations such as United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) might have thousands of troops, but they are deployed in thin bands across a border to monitor a withdrawal and a ceasefire. They have no other mandate, and, being where they are, obviously cannot possibly take on economic, social or other tasks, or even advise on them, such local knowledge as they gather being limited to the borders they police.

Even new operations within a single country, such as the one contemplated for the Congo, the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), would be deployed very selectively. MONUC would have little information about what was happening in the rest of that vast country, would find it very hard to discharge even the military mandate it has been given, and would be in no position to do anything else.

The United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) are the three exceptions in recent years to this rule.

Trying to draw general conclusions from these very exceptional cases is dangerous and was one of the more serious shortcomings of the Brahimi report. In Kosovo and East Timor, the United Nations runs transitional administrations, as it does not and should not in other post-conflict situations. Speaking here on November 29 last year on the lessons for post-conflict peace-building to be learnt from the United Nations experience in Guinea-Bissau, the Secretary-General said that, in devising mandates for peace-building missions or revising the mandates or exit strategies for existing ones, the Council should bear in mind that Governments in post-conflict situations might be weak and not able to take action which should normally be undertaken by a sovereign Government. This is what the United Nations does in Kosovo and East Timor, where it took over in a vacuum. Where a Government is in place, no matter how weak, the United Nations should do nothing to give the impression that the Government is a cipher and that authority resides in the peacekeeping operation. That will undermine, not build, peace.

The Secretary-General also asked for more flexible financial arrangements for post-conflict situations, and he asked the Council to support the Brahimi recommendation that a percentage of a

mission's initial budget be set aside to fund quick-impact projects. We understand what the Secretary-General has in mind. Indeed, wherever Indian troops have been deployed, they help the local communities with practical projects, digging wells and building schools and roads, as the Council's mission to Sierra Leone has seen. Our troops are trained to take on projects in aid of civil authority and they respond to local needs, expressed to them by community leaders. It is another thing entirely for projects to be conceived and funded from New York, which might seem attractive, but be either unsuitable or unsustainable.

In fact, in the debate on East Timor in the Council on 26 January, the representative of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) made this very point. Donors were being generous because East Timor was a high-profile undertaking, but he warned, as others have before him, that when interest faded, what may be beneficial today may be too costly tomorrow. And on flexible funding, the Council will remember that what Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello called a "cruel budget", the IMF representative described as realistic.

Clearly there are hard choices to be made, but the Security Council is not the place to make them. It does not have the mandate or the expertise to decide these issues, and if major extra financial provisions were built into the budgets of peacekeeping operations, these would be funded through assessed contributions. There are several regions where countries recovering from conflict border others teetering on the brink. It would be unjust and self-defeating for the post-conflict country to have its development paid for through assessed contributions because the Council had mandated it, while, for very much the same needs, its neighbours, in very much the same desperate circumstances, had to scramble for a share of a shrinking global official development assistance. Blatantly unequal treatment, within countries as between them, does not build peace – it breeds conflict.

The dark side of what the United Nations does in Kosovo and East Timor is Iraq. There too, though there is a Government in place, it is the United Nations that determines local needs and how they shall be met. The oil-for-food programme is post-conflict peace-building of sorts, but no one — neither the Secretariat, nor the Brahimi Panel, nor the vast literature on this subject – ever refers to the United Nations experiment in Iraq as a precedent to follow. But if Iraq is sui generis, so too are Kosovo and East Timor.

It is not that the Council has no role at all. Members of the Council can help in some ways in post-conflict peace-building. In disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, which peacekeeping operations are expected to supervise, experience has shown that armed gangs do not hand over the weapons without which they might be lynched by those they have terrorized or be unable to force others to give them food and shelter. For disarmament, demobilization and reintegration to succeed, the peacekeeping force must be so visibly strong on arrival that all parties to the conflict realize that it has the means of protecting them if they surrender their weapons and can overwhelm anyone foolhardy enough to try to take it on. Unfortunately, the Council almost never authorizes this, and its frugality has been shown to be a disastrous and false economy.

Secondly, most conflicts are still fought with small arms and light weapons. Effective arms embargoes are one way of reducing the risk of conflicts being resumed, but members of the Council have a larger role here. Some of them are the principal manufacturers and exporters of these weapons; they must ensure that arms are not exported from their territories to States, non-state actors, terrorists or rebel groups that use violence against legitimate Governments.

Finally, the instrument the Council uses for post-conflict peace-building is the peacekeeping operation, but it is the Secretariat that chooses the troop contributors. Because the peacekeepers play so important a role, the Council needs to give some thought to this. Some standard and minimum requirements must be laid down, and these must be both professional and political. The Serbian Special Police are quite effective in what they do, but the United Nations has not deployed them as civilian police in East Timor, nor has it tried to legitimize the former East Timorese militias by offering them jobs in the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor. This is natural; the United Nations can promote democracy, respect for civilian authority, the peaceful resolution of disputes and national reconciliation only through peacekeeping forces who understand, from national experience, what all this means. It would be a travesty, for instance, and an insult to promote post-conflict peace-building in Sierra Leone through peacekeepers who overthrow democracies at home.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of India for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Cappagli (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for February and for your initiative of convening on open debate on such a complex and vital issue as that of peace-building. We also wish to thank you for the drafting of the document before us, which I believe is a very good basis for this exchange of ideas.

I also wish to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Singapore, Ambassador Mabhubani, and his delegation for their excellent guidance of the work of the Security Council in January.

Argentina attaches special importance to all issues relating to peacekeeping. It is our understanding that, in the framework of providing a comprehensive approach to conflicts, the concept of peace-building complements the traditional idea of peacekeeping.

By virtue of resolution 1318 (2000) of 7 September 2000, which was an outcome of the Millennium Summit, the Security Council pledged to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations in considering conflicts at all their stages, ranging from prevention to settlement and post-conflict peace-building, and it encouraged the formulation of broad and comprehensive strategies aimed at remedying the fundamental causes of conflict, including their economic and social dimensions.

For its part, the Millennium Declaration, adopted by the General Assembly, decided to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and security by providing the Organization with the resources and the instruments that it needs for its tasks of conflict prevention, peaceful settlement of disputes, peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building and reconstruction.

The evolution of the concept of peace-building has demonstrated the close relationship between this concept and conflict prevention. Viewed from this angle, what we call peace-building is aimed on the one hand at eliminating the deep-rooted causes of a given conflict and, on the other hand, at adopting a range of different types of measures to prevent the outbreak of a conflict. Currently the elements of peace-building are present in all peacekeeping initiatives. The international community has understood that a lasting peace must be accompanied by an extended complex and effective process following the conflict. Peace-building is essentially a political process, taking into account its objectives.

The challenge of implementing a strategy of this type requires, in every specific case, a coordinated effort on the part of the international community in the preparation of a range of different types of measures: political, diplomatic, economic, social and institutional. This range of measures can be implemented only if there is political will and a commitment on the part of the international community to do so through both the United Nations system and the competent regional organizations in each case.

The components of a strategy would include the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants, the situation of refugees and displaced persons, the eradication of poverty, the promotion of sustainable development, the protection of human rights and the strengthening of the rule of law and of democratic institutions. From this standpoint, my country attaches special importance to the promotion of development and of human rights, for we understand this to be the greatest contribution that can be made by the international system to prevent future conflicts.

In his statement at the Millennium Summit, my country's head of State, Mr. Fernando de la Rúa, emphasized the close relationship between development and peace. He said, "poverty elimination is a fundamental factor in conflict prevention". (*A/55/PV.6, p. 13*). He went on to say that it was necessary that countries become aware of that relationship in order to refine a system of conflict resolution in keeping with the new international setting.

For Argentina, the most efficient way of preventing conflicts is to tackle their real causes. In this context, we understand the eradication of poverty to be one of the principal responsibilities of the United Nations in this century. In other words, we seek a reaffirmation of the role of development in all of its dimensions. At the same time, we understand that the promotion of pluralistic and tolerant societies that ensure the protection of human rights and that are non-

discriminatory and respectful of political, ethnic or religious minorities creates a natural barrier to the outbreak of new conflicts.

Any strategy for peace-building that is not structured around these fundamental concepts could fall short when it comes to acting on the real causes of conflicts. This could even affect confidence in the United Nations system and its future involvement in a given region. Likewise, the coordinated participation of all competent international actors should be encouraged, with special emphasis on the regional organizations, international financial organizations and the States affected. In this respect, we hope that the meetings with the regional organizations that will be starting tomorrow will benefit current and future processes.

The development of a comprehensive strategy should take into account the specifics of each concrete case. It is our understanding that in peace-building, no conflict is the same as another, and it is only through a clear understanding of the causes of a conflict that it will be possible to prepare a strategy for peace-building. As was mentioned in "An Agenda for Peace" in 1992, "Preventive steps must be based on timely and accurate knowledge of the facts." (*S/24111, para. 25*)

Lastly, it would be appropriate to analyse the Security Council's role in the peace-building process. The Presidential Statement of 30 November 1999 recognized the importance of building a culture of prevention of armed conflicts and the need for all the principal bodies of the United Nations to contribute in this regard. Likewise, on that occasion, the Council emphasized its ongoing commitment to deal with the prevention of armed conflicts in all parts of the world, and it recognized the important role played by regional organizations and arrangements in conflict prevention.

In recent years, and in the exercise of its competence in the peace-building process, the Security Council has incorporated elements in some peacekeeping mandates that relate to the peace-building process. In other cases, peacekeeping missions have been succeeded by United Nations support offices for peace-building programmes; such cases are Liberia, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau and Haiti.

In any event, it should be pointed out that the Security Council has an important role to play in these peace-building processes — a role of coordinating the work of the many players that participate in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort and to maximize efficiency.

The preservation of peace by its very nature is a long-standing process that requires from the international community an action that is sustained over time, sufficient resources and a shared and coordinated political will. In this joint effort, we must not lose sight of the priorities of the affected States. The success of a peace-building strategy will depend on the will of the States concerned to participate, on the level of coordination of those involved and on the availability of the needed resources.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: I thank the representative of Argentina for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Malaysia, whom I invite to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Hasmy (Malaysia): My delegation congratulates you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month and pays tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani of Singapore, for his outstanding leadership of the Council last month.

We commend you on your timely initiative in convening this meeting of the Council on this important subject, coinciding with the fourth high-level meeting at United Nations Headquarters between the United Nations and regional organizations. I trust that our deliberations today will provide useful inputs to this high-level meeting, particularly in the context of the supportive but important roles of regional organizations vis-à-vis the United Nations in the area of peace-building.

We all recognize the integral relationship between the maintenance of international peace and security, on the one hand, and peace-building, on the other. There is clearly a need for a more integrated, holistic approach in dealing with the two processes. Indeed, in a fragmented approach to dealing with peacemaking, peacekeeping, economic development, humanitarian assistance, refugees and institution-building — which are all important aspects of peace-building — the various components can sometimes work at cross purposes with each other, resulting in petty bureaucratic rivalries and jealousies and turf battles, when none should exist at all. These components must

be glued together through a coordination of efforts and a pooling of resources if they are to make a real impact on the ground.

Not just the Security Council, but the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) also have their own important roles in the area of peace-building. Given the comprehensive nature of peace and the integral relationship between peacekeeping, peacemaking and peace-building, there should be increased consultations and coordination between the Council, the Assembly and ECOSOC, without prejudice to the competence of other organs and agencies of the United Nations. We are encouraged by this trend, as shown in the case of the United Nations involvement in Haiti that evolved from the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti to the International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti, which we hope will be a model for United Nations involvement in other conflict situations in the future.

A concrete action by the Council in the area of peace-building is, obviously, to strengthen further the post-conflict peace-building components of peacekeeping operations, thereby increasing the multidimensional character of these operations by co-opting expertise and resources not only from troop-contributing countries, but also from relevant United Nations and other international agencies, including non-governmental organizations operating in the area of peace-building and related activities. This could be more effectively done through consultations between the Council and all other relevant organs of the United Nations, such as ECOSOC, and other relevant international agencies such as the World Bank, when a peacekeeping operation is being designed or revised, in much the same way the Council traditionally consults with troop-contributing countries.

During these consultations there will be identification of areas of responsibility between the core elements of peacekeeping that belong to the Council, and the equally important elements of peace-building, particularly in the post-conflict period, that more appropriately belong to other United Nations organs, such as ECOSOC. Such close consultations will allow for enhanced coordination of their respective programmes and activities on the ground and a seamless transition from one phase of the international presence to another.

We believe the Security Council can be a catalyst in enhancing interest in, and securing commitment to, peace-building, particularly post-conflict peace-building, by convening more open meetings in this Chamber focusing on, inter alia, peace-building efforts in conflict situations. Indeed, this has been done on a number of occasions in the past. My delegation would encourage further such meetings, focusing not only on the need for sustained political/diplomatic support for the peace process in a specific conflict situation, but also on the peace-building needs of the war-ravaged country concerned. Such an open meeting would afford the opportunity for the international community to appreciate the pressing needs of the people concerned directly from their representative, the Secretariat and the relevant United Nations agencies, as well as from other international agencies that may be invited to participate in these meetings.

Such meetings in the Council relating to aspects of peace-building need not be at the expense of other United Nations organs, as similar deliberations on specific situations could take place in the General Assembly or ECOSOC, perhaps in close coordination with, and including appropriate inputs from, the Security Council, thereby making more tangible the cooperation among these important organs of the United Nations.

Consultations and coordination between the Security Council and ECOSOC in particular could perhaps be effected through joint meetings of their respective working groups. Indeed, on appropriate occasions, it may not be inconceivable to have joint meetings of the two Councils themselves to effect even greater cooperation between them, if their rules of procedure could be made more flexible. After all, they are masters of their own procedures. Indeed, the basis for close cooperation and interaction between the Security Council and ECOSOC already exists in Article 65 of the Charter, which we feel should be more frequently invoked. The United Nations must find creative and innovative ways of doing its work and not allow itself to be constrained by restrictive procedures or antiquated ways of doing things.

Coordinating peacekeeping and peace-building activities and assisting a country by moving it from a conflict situation to peace-building require strong and effective leadership on the part of the United Nations. The overall coordinator, of course, is the Secretary-General himself, but he needs to be assisted by a

number of special representatives, coordinators, transitional administrators or other high representatives who he entrusts to carry out important tasks in the field.

Clearly, in the face of more complex operations in the field, this system must be further strengthened with adequate resources, through the appointment of highly competent and skilled United Nations officials to assist the Secretary-General in dealing with the various important actors. These would include the Governments concerned, the relevant United Nations agencies, the World Bank and other international financial and funding institutions, as well as non-governmental organizations and the private sector that have programmes on the ground. Clearly, there is a role here for skilful personal diplomacy on the part of the Secretary-General, as well as on the part of the representatives he appoints; hence the importance of these appointments.

Peacekeeping operations alone do not guarantee peace-building, which requires an integrated and multifaceted approach. While peacekeeping operations are aimed at creating an atmosphere of stability in the short term, it is imperative that other measures be instituted to address the post-conflict situation in the medium and longer terms.

An important measure, which has now become an indispensable component of current peacekeeping operations, is the programme to disarm, demobilize and reintegrate former combatants. Without the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme, or DDR for short, there is always the risk of a return to conflict when the presence of alienated and disgruntled ex-combatants and easy availability of arms can create a highly volatile situation. Some aspects of DDR go beyond traditional peacekeeping; hence the importance of an integrated approach to peacekeeping operations and the need to co-opt other actors in the broader context of peace-building.

The DDR programme is a potent instrument for peace-building in that, when successfully implemented, it will prevent a slide back to conflict. It should therefore be strongly supported and strengthened with the necessary funding by the international community. Indeed, with DDR, as with all other aspects of peacekeeping and peace-building, adequate funding is crucial to the entire exercise. The issue of funding therefore must be seriously addressed by all concerned.

It is not easy to draw a distinction between peacekeeping and peace-building. In addition, while some peace-building activities might occur only after a peacekeeping operation ends, they also might well be part of the peace accord which the peacekeeping mission is intended to support. Peace-building does not always start where peacekeeping stops. Peace-building is a long-term process, lasting many years after a conflict has ended. There is always a grey area or an unavoidable overlap between them; hence the importance of close coordination between the two processes.

The lack of continuity between the different stages of international action after a conflict can do great damage to the effectiveness of peace-building actions, in particular following the completion of an operation's mandate. An appropriate transition must be planned when the Security Council decides on the ending of an operation. This strategy must be in place in order to avoid an interruption of programmes or the substitution of new partners that have a different approach from that which was followed previously. The Security Council had this in mind when it deliberated on the topic "No exit without strategy" under the presidency of the Netherlands last year.

In conclusion, my delegation looks forward to concrete follow-up actions to this debate if we are serious about making peace-building an important business of the United Nations. Many ideas have been discussed and suggestions made today; many other ideas were offered by the Secretary-General in his statement this morning, in addition to those in reports that he has submitted to the Security Council and the General Assembly. The time has come for us to take up the challenge and to move from generalities to concrete action. If this happens soon, this open meeting of the Council, under your presidency, Sir, will have served its purpose. Otherwise, this debate, like some others in the past, will add to the burden of inaction which, I am sorry to say, has sometimes characterized the workings of our Organization.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Malaysia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of New Zealand. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MacKay (New Zealand): Let me begin by congratulating you, Sir, on assuming the presidency and by offering my best wishes for your term of office. Let me also applaud your initiative in convening, so early in your term, this open debate on peace-building. We welcome the opportunity to discuss this important subject at an open meeting of the Council.

In the Council's open debate on this issue in March last year, my predecessor noted that the complexities and challenges of peace-building deserved thorough consideration in this forum. It is reassuring that the Council remains actively seized of this issue.

There is growing recognition that peace-building is an essential part of the work of this Organization, and, indeed, the level of participation in this debate attests to that. But we also acknowledge the Secretary-General's call this morning to further increase the profile of peace-building. Half, or more than half, of United Nations peacekeeping operations now involve an element of peace-building; indeed, in many cases, trying to keep the peace without taking further steps to cement peace and reduce the chance of the conflict resuming would simply fail to address the problem and would be an inefficient use of scarce resources. Peace-building is currently playing an essential role in peace operations in my own region: in East Timor; in the Papua New Guinea island of Bougainville, where the United Nations maintains a Political Office; and in Solomon Islands, where an International Peace Monitoring Team has been deployed under the terms of the Townsville Peace Agreement.

New Zealand welcomed the fine work of Ambassador Brahimi and his Panel, including their focus on peace-building. The Panel noted that for peace-building to be effective, active, multidimensional engagement with local parties is essential. Meaningful interaction with civil society, instituting and upholding democratic norms, the effective use of United Nations civilian police and the protection and promotion of human rights are all required if peace-building is to be effective. The Brahimi Panel's recommendations on these issues are extremely useful.

We were also heartened by the support of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations for exploring the Panel's recommendation that a small percentage of a peacekeeping mission's first-year budget be made available to heads of mission to fund quick impact projects targeted at enhancing peace mission effectiveness. The importance of such projects in achieving support among local communities for peace operations and reconciliation cannot be overestimated. We also support the Committee's recommendation that programmes for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration be provided with adequate and timely resources.

We welcome the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET). The East Timor operation clearly demonstrates the complexity of peace-building in practice, and the relevance of the Brahimi Panel's findings. While a great deal has been achieved in the humanitarian and security fields, further progress is needed in the peace-building side of the operation — for example, the greater transfer of authority to the East Timorese themselves, the establishment of the East Timor Defence Force and the effective functioning of the legal and judicial systems. New Zealand encourages UNTAET in its continuing efforts to build upon its achievements and address these areas, and stands ready to provide ongoing assistance. The granting of greater flexibility in the use of the UNTAET budget to the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Vieira de Mello, would facilitate progress in these areas.

Recent days have brought news of positive developments in negotiations between the Papua New Guinea Government and the people of Bougainville. New Zealand welcomes these wholeheartedly. The success so far of the Bougainville peace process not only demonstrates goodwill on the part of the former parties to the conflict and the importance of communities taking responsibility for working together to resolve their differences, but also underlines the importance of peace-building, through the demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, the restoration of civil authority and the focusing of donor efforts on rebuilding Bougainville's economy. Efforts in the these areas have been crucial in establishing the foundations for a lasting peace. It is worth noting that local and international non-governmental organizations have played key roles. New Zealand and other donors have been able to support peace-building efforts through the targeting of assistance to quick impact projects, including New Zealand Volunteer Service Abroad's work in retraining former combatants.

In Solomon Islands, the provision of an international team to assist with disarmament has resulted in some progress with regard to the return of weapons. Nevertheless significant challenges remain, and the will of the combatants themselves to support the peace process is of critical importance.

The work of the Brahimi Panel, the report (A/C.4/55/6) of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the continuing focus on this topic in this forum present the international community with opportunities to reflect on the way we address post-conflict situations with a view to improving the outcomes for those involved in and affected by the conflict, and also for peacekeeping in general. Last year, New Zealand non-governmental organizations organized a seminar entitled "Peace and Security in the New Millennium: How Can New Zealand Contribute?" The seminar proceedings covered a wide range of relevant issues and noted that

> "Prevention of war ... is a multi-faceted exercise, and it requires patience and collaboration across sectors in our own society, within our region and ... internationally".

Despite our best efforts at conflict prevention — and we could always do better — there will be times when the international community has to pick up the pieces following war. When this happens, we should be prepared not only to preside over newly arrived-at peace, but we must also continue to be prepared to adopt a broad, multidimensional approach to ensure that the peace arrived at is sustainable and that the resumption of the conflict is prevented.

We encourage the Organization to continue to find innovative ways to enable peacekeeping operations to address the broader needs of peace-building. We believe this will require the General Assembly to grant greater authority and more flexibility to heads of peacekeeping operations so that they can administer their budgets in a way that maximizes their responsiveness to local needs, thus enhancing the prospects for lasting peace.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of New Zealand for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Croatia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Šimonović (Croatia): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing today's open debate. I wish also to commend you for following the example set by your predecessor, Singapore, and circulating a background document for today's debate. I hope that such a procedure will be endorsed as a common practice by future Presidents of the Council.

I found the document helpful, but most of all enticing, as it spelled out clearly the twofold objectives of today's debate: to reaffirm the political will of the international community and to make progress towards defining a common approach to peace-building.

It has been proved time and again, by the recurrence of conflicts in Asia, Africa and Europe, that the costs of not engaging in a timely and comprehensive manner in peace-building can quickly outpace the costs of investments in peace. Relatedly, engaging only in a selective few peace-building activities or in a discontinuous fashion can also be proved to outweigh the costs of devising and executing a comprehensive and sustained effort in peace-building. Finally, in terms of cost bearers, in the era of the globalization of markets in goods, services and, increasingly, labour, one can argue that costs of non-intervention in peace-building are borne by both the post-conflict society and the international community. The costs involved in managing the refugee outflows, their temporary or permanent resettlement and the spread of crime, infectious diseases and other maladies are just some examples that come to mind from the perspective of the international community. In addition to these, the host societies often have to grapple with a number of other difficulties, usually on shoestring budgets.

Post-conflict societies exhibit all the characteristics of weak societies, regardless of whether they have a weak or strong State. Their infrastructure is destroyed or damaged, they suffer from depopulation or overpopulation in certain regions, the people are needy, resources are scarce; human rights are not efficiently protected and painful memories are still fresh. Unfortunately, we know of these ills first-hand. Croatia is still grappling with some of them while trying to help others that are much worse off in the region. In this regard, we sincerely hope that we can all heed the call issued by the Secretary-General in his report "Renewing the United Nations: a programme for reform" (A/51/950). In that report the Secretary-General obliquely stated that successful peace-building

requires a mutually reinforcing political strategy and assistance programme, incorporating human rights considerations and humanitarian and development programmes. The importance to peace-building of the mutual reaffirmation of these two approaches cannot be overemphasized.

The post-war reconstruction and reconciliation in Croatia are processes that necessarily take time, but can be accelerated through international support. Many displaced persons and refugees have returned, even though the economic and social situation in war-affected areas remains difficult, with soaring unemployment rates. There is a significant shortage of capital for new investment, job creation and specific projects, in particular demining. Over a million mines are still scattered on Croatian soil. Therefore, the already invested political, human and financial resources of the international community in Croatia should be coupled with development assistance if the desired results are to be achieved. Investment in peace, followed by investment in development, is part of the same continuum.

The establishment of truth about a conflict and the punishment of perpetrators of conflict-related grave breaches of humanitarian law are other prerequisites for the re-establishment of peace and security. On the global level, the establishment of the International Criminal Court should serve to aid and expedite the healing and reconciliation process.

In closing, I would like to make a few observations and suggestions regarding a need for a shared comprehensive strategy for peace-building for the Security Council to ponder. First, I commend the Council for incorporating disarmament, demobilization and reintegration components in several past and ongoing peace operations. This is useful and should become a standard bracket in each applicable peacekeeping mandate, as early on as possible. Likewise, the provisions regarding refugees and displaced persons, demining and other stimuli for effective economic recovery, as well as provisions on strengthening the rule of law and democratic institutions, must be anticipated and mandated by the Council in a timely fashion. This of course rests upon three important pillars: cooperation of the post-conflict society, sustainable political will on the part of the international community and an adequate bureaucratic capacity of the United Nations in general and the Secretariat in particular.

The United Nations system has a proven record of cooperation in peace-building activities with intergovernmental regional organizations, as well as non-governmental organizations. This is certainly fertile ground for future expansion of cooperation, and the Security Council can play an important role in this effort. However, we must recognize that the United Nations Secretariat needs capacity to coordinate these efforts with its partners, as well as among its own agencies. In some areas of expertise the Secretariat lacks the minimum standing capacity. If we ask the Secretariat to anticipate and respond to peace-building needs in a well-orchestrated, timely and, therefore, efficient manner, we must provide it with the capacity to do so.

Besides its role as an advocate for and guarantor of peace-building implementation, the Council can actively reach out to other principal United Nations bodies. In this regard, the role of the Economic and Social Council complements that of the Security Council. Indeed, the Economic and Social Council, with its broad agenda concerning the eradication of poverty and economic and social development, remains best equipped both to identify in a timely manner and to act pre-emptively upon these very causes of new or recurrent conflicts.

Therefore, I see great value in a potential joint follow-up meeting of the two councils on this or related matters in the near future. We must make an effort to build closer ties in order to address the converging agendas of world peace and world development.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Croatia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Nepal. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sharma (Nepal): I wish to begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. Let me also thank you for selecting as a topic for open debate the theme of peace-building, a topical issue of fundamental significance for peace and security in the world. The paper you have circulated (S/2001/82, annex) is useful for organizing our thoughts.

Armies may sometimes win a battle, but humanity always loses the war. Humanity bleeds in victory and in defeat. Countless lives are lost and colossal wealth that could do tremendous good by making a difference in people's lives is destroyed. Children lose their fathers, wives their husbands and parents their sons. Ironically, conflict bedevils those who can least afford it. Each bullet that is fired burns up several children's hopes of buying textbooks. Every bomb that is blasted engulfs resources sufficient to build several schools and hospitals and to construct several miles of road.

Conflicts are inherently evil, for they bring unspeakable misery and pain, mostly to innocent women and children. But they, sadly, happen with remarkable frequency, now more within States than between States. We are all members of the same human family. Globalization has brought us closer together. Every war is now our war, not theirs.

Through the Charter, the community of nations entrusted the task of maintaining world peace to the United Nations, and particularly to the Security Council. It is the solemn treaty obligation — besides being a moral imperative — of members of the Security Council, as the collective guarantors of peace, to shoulder that responsibility. It is also the bounden duty of other States to collaborate with the Council.

We must do everything in our power, as nations and as people, to prevent war through the peaceful settlement of disputes and to save humanity from its scourge. But the Security Council has seldom been able to stave off the hostility that burns the bridges between people, making settlement more difficult, if not impossible. Failing that, the Security Council is left with only one costly, second-rate alternative: to manage conflict once it begins to exact its price. The complexity of this option is compounded when the Council has to grapple in tandem with peacekeeping, peace-building and peacemaking, each one quite involved in itself.

"An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111) and the report (S/2000/809) of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations chaired by Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi both recognized peace-building as a powerful tool to sustain peace once it has been restored. But it is exceptionally complex to devise and to implement. The Brahimi report is indicative of the tangle involved. It contends that effective peace-building requires active engagement with the local parties, and that such engagement should be multidimensional in nature.

Building peace is a long and complicated process, not an isolated event; it has to be part of a larger nation-building process. It is all the more formidable because it has to be achieved when central authority may have broken down, when law and order are non-existent and when local institutions are dysfunctional. It means, in a way, beginning to convert the seemingly impossible into the possible in as short a span as possible, amidst the heightened animosity of conflict, by bringing clashing stakeholders together, by reasoning with them and convincing them to put their bitter past behind, and by moving them on towards a common high goal.

Since it touches all aspects of national life, peace-building must be comprehensive in content, participatory and inclusive in approach, and conciliatory in nature. But primarily, it is a complicated political process where jockeying for advantage, bargaining and hard compromises become fundamental rules of the game. Understanding has to be built where there is none. The entire society has to be brought on board by building confidence, so that no one feels left out or deceived, which would be a sure recipe for future tension.

Peace-building, therefore, is a fairly long commitment on the part of the United Nations and the international community, and it taxes their patience and resources considerably. To make it work, the Council must set a clear and achievable objective that can be realized in a span of three to five years and must chalk out a comprehensive plan accordingly.

Identifying a problem, it is said, is half the solution. Conflicts have been both causes and consequences of a number of social ailments. Poverty, for instance, is a time bomb ready to explode at the slightest provocation — and there are provocateurs aplenty: terrorists, drug barons, smugglers and thugs selling dreams to the poor and cajoling them into catastrophe. Ethnic, religious and cultural fault lines have long been understood as underpinning various upheavals. Colonial legacies and unscrupulous political elements have undermined peace in numerous situations.

One might wish that there were prototype solutions to intricate peace and security problems. But there are none. A peace-building plan needs to be

evolved, keeping in perspective the configuration of the actors and factors prevailing in each unique situation and dovetailing it with a larger framework of nation-building. Focus should be on reviving and strengthening endogenous institutions and processes rather than on supplanting them with exogenous ones. It is important quickly to build local capacity that can uphold and sustain peace against heavy odds and to enable external involvement to be gradually phased out.

Partnership, cooperation and coordination become essential to produce synergy and to optimize the impact of collective efforts. It is as critical among the key stakeholders in the State in conflict as it is between such a State and external actors or among external players. The easiest option is not necessarily the best. The Council must do what is right, not what is easy. This is a hard choice, but it is the defining virtue and ideal that the founding fathers contemplated for the United Nations.

The Council must overcome the natural temptation to choose the line of least resistance. Reconciliation, not divorce, ought to be our goal. Cambodia and Mozambique present an earnest, if still fragile, effort at conciliation. But most other peace-building missions, including those in East Timor and in the Balkans, have left a sour taste in one mouth or another. We must strive to heal the wound, not to amputate the limb at the first sign of trouble.

As the sovereign equality of States is the foundation of the United Nations, it becomes incumbent on each of us not to trivialize this fundamental premise. If there is a gulf between the segments of the population, we need to narrow it; if there are disagreements, we should seek to promote rapprochement. Unless people in a State themselves so decide, the United Nations must not engage in severing a part from the whole and undermining the sanctity and integrity of a State.

The reason for this is simple. Differences are bound to occur even in a State of ethnic or religious homogeneity, but they do not validate separation; rather, they offer the first lesson in tolerance and challenge us to foster unity in diversity.

A pattern of selective involvement in conflict situations has at times prompted many to question the objectivity and fairness of the Security Council in its operations. The Council must try to engage on the merit of each case, not on the basis of the political priorities of its members. It will have to begin with the Council's establishing general guidelines for the Secretariat to follow when recommending to the Council a specific course of action in a particular conflict situation. Only this standard-setting will enable the Secretariat to tell the Council what it needs to know, rather than what it wants to hear. This measure will tremendously enhance the international community's confidence in the Council and facilitate the work of the Secretariat.

Nepal has always maintained that, whenever the Security Council engages in activities that touch on the scope of other competent bodies and agencies, it must involve all relevant international agencies and regional mechanisms in the process. This will be in the interest of the Council itself in the long run, as it can liberally draw on the competence of other relevant bodies as well as carefully save itself from stretching itself too thin and rendering itself ineffective.

Conflict manifests a complex set of political, economic, social and cultural problems inherent in our societies. Therefore, there are no easy solutions to it. Peace-building ought to be an effort in the utmost sincerity as the first step to nation-building, not just to bring temporary relief that is unlikely to last. That will be a more effective, credible and less expensive way to promote peace in the service of all humanity. Time is of the essence in this context. As is said, a stitch in time saves nine. The Council will do well to change its habit of doing too little too late at an unconscionable cost.

Nepal appreciates the Council's good work in many situations and encourages the Council to stave off an advancing storm, rather than wait to clean up the mess after the fury has hit the ground. We have worked with the Council closely in the past and remain committed to doing so in a spirit of cooperation and common good.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Nepal for his kind words addressed to me.

I shall now make a brief statement in my capacity as representative of Tunisia.

I shall not repeat the points addressed by earlier speakers, but I wish to start by stating that the experience of past years has shown the need of the

Organization to adjust its working methods in order to give the issue of peace-building its due priority, raising it high on the international community's agenda.

The close link between conflict prevention and peace-building points to the importance of maintaining peace and approaching it in all its aspects, as has been stressed in today's discussion. In our view, this approach must be anchored in a comprehensive and integrated strategy and must involve all partners. It must identify the questions of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, poverty and marginalization, the establishment of law and order and the promotion of human rights as critical to peace-building.

When we discuss the role of the Security Council in peace-building, we must recall that the Council has adopted many resolutions promoting peace and has attached high priority to it as a means of addressing the root causes of conflict and tension, including poverty, suffering and all forms of deprivation arising from economic and social backwardness. It is these elements that cause violence and conflict.

I shall not repeat the statements of many speakers during the Millennium Summit and the resolution adopted last September by the Security Council on the need to develop a comprehensive and integrated strategy within the United Nations system to address all these root causes of conflict. I do wish to say, however, that these commitments, adopted at the highest international political level, represent the appropriate and optimum embodiment of the interlinkage between and integration of development, peace and stability.

The United Nations system is therefore called upon to develop the basic elements necessary to maintaining this partnership. This will require us to adopt a new approach to addressing conflict and tension. What is needed today from the international community is a qualitative leap in addressing the issue of peace-building. As I have indicated, it must do so by focusing effectively on the root causes of conflict, rather than on the symptoms. To that end, Tunisia feels that there must be a comprehensive approach predicated on three points.

First is the importance of developing innovative mechanisms commensurate with the problems of poverty and deprivation, along with the other inherent causes of conflict. Such mechanisms must be flexible and effective, providing an expeditious response to the established requirements of the most needy areas. In this regard, many initiatives have been proposed, particularly in the context of the General Assembly at its current session, to revive existing mechanisms and to consolidate integration among all bodies of the international community. In this context, I would cite the General Assembly's welcome, in its resolution on the implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty, of the initiative to establish the World Solidarity Fund for Poverty Eradication.

The other point is that a comprehensive and integrated peace strategy must be developed to address all aspects of peace, including political, economic, social and humanitarian aspects. Such a strategy should be developed with the involvement of all international partners, and roles should be assigned to them, whether the United Nations, regional and subregional organizations or international financial institutions and of course the State concerned. The central responsibility should remain with the United Nations, given its unique stature and role in international relations. The strategy must be put into place within the context of respect for the mandate and responsibility of all United Nations organs.

The third and last point, given the organic and growing relationship between the maintenance of international peace and security and peace-building, is the fact that it has become essential that the Security Council give a push to the international community's efforts to consolidate peace, since the Council has a special responsibility is in this area. As we can see from today's discussions, the Council can perform this role through mobilization of the political will of the international community so that its resources, especially financial, can be mobilized to establish and promote peace in fulfilment of the provisions of the Charter on behalf of all peoples of the world.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

With the indulgence of Council members, at the end of this debate I would like to thank all delegations that participated in these important discussions for their valuable input and worthwhile ideas that underscore the importance and relevance of the issues under discussion.

Without being exhaustive, let me cite the following points. First is the need to develop a common approach between the United Nations and all participating actors in order to develop a practical, comprehensive and integrated strategy to promote peace, taking into account the primary responsibility of the State concerned. Second is the need to support the capabilities of the Secretary-General, especially as regards coordination of the agreed strategy. Third, we must take into account the necessity of this strategy focusing efficiently on the deep roots of conflicts, especially the economic and social roots, due to the close links between security, stability and development. Fourth, it need be considered that the elimination of poverty is a collective international responsibility and that an innovative approach and mechanism must be developed to address poverty and economic backwardness; flexibility is essential in order to respond expeditiously to the urgent needs of vulnerable groups. Fifth, there is a need to focus on sound governance, democracy and the building of State institutions as essential ingredients for promoting peace; also, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, while paying special and adequate attention to children, refugees, internally displaced persons and the promotion of the role of women in peace-building. Sixth, there must be coordination among all active parties and apportionment of responsibilities in the area of peace-building, especially with the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

In the seventh place, let us underscore the special importance of the Security Council in mobilizing international political will, given its special responsibility in the area of international peace and security and the close relationship between the maintenance of peace and security, conflict prevention and peace-building. Eighth is the need to start consultations among all active parties at an early stage, before establishing any peacekeeping mission, for better preparation and coordination towards that goal. Lastly, in the ninth place, there is a need to promote international partnership in all phases of conflict prevention and peace-building; this partnership should be sustainable and continuous.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place on Friday, 16 February 2001.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.